Career Service Board Meeting #2387
Minutes
Thursday, August 20, 2020, 9:00am

Conference Call

Karen DuWaldt (Co-Chair)
Neil Peck (Co-Chair)
Patricia Barela Rivera
David Hayes
LaNee Reynolds

I. Opening: Meeting was called to order at 9:00am. Neil Peck, Board Co-Chair, asked for a roll call of those present for the record.

All members of the Career Service Board were present, in addition to Bob Wolf, Asst. Sr. City Attorney to the Board, and Karen Niparko, Executive Director, Office of Human Resources (“OHR”).

1. Approval of the Agenda for the August 20, 2020 Board Meeting.
   Board Member David Hayes made a motion, seconded by Board Co-Chair Neil Peck, to approve the agenda for the August 20, 2020 meeting, which was approved unanimously by the Board.

2. Approval of the Minutes for the August 11 and July 16, 2020 Board Meetings.
   Board Member Patricia Barela Rivera made a motion, seconded by Board Co-Chair Karen DuWaldt, to approve the minutes for the August 11 and July 16, 2020 meetings, which was approved unanimously by the Board.

II. Board Comments: None.

III. Public Comments: None.

IV. Public Hearing:

   1. Classification Notice No. 1658 – Self-Represented Litigant Administrator and Judicial Assistant I – IV

      Greg Thress, Sr. Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Classification Notice No. 1658 to amend the Classification & Pay Plan by creating the new classification of Self-Represented Litigant Administrator, and revising the Judicial Assistant I, II, III, and IV job specifications.

      The Judicial Assistant classifications were established in 2008 and not been reviewed since their inception. The study involved four job classifications (Judicial Assistant I, II, III, and IV) encompassing 124 incumbents in two agencies, 117 employees in the Denver County Court (“DCC”) and 7 employees in the Department of Safety (“DOS”).

      The purpose of the study was to review the job duties Judicial Assistants are performing and to update job specifications as needed. The study also reviewed the pay grade structures to ensure that the Judicial Assistants pay grades were market competitive.
As a result of the review, a new job classification is being created, Self-Represented Litigant Administrator, which are duties required by the Colorado Supreme Court., and the Judicial Assistant I, II, III and IV job specifications were revised.

### NEW JOB CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Title</th>
<th>Proposed New Pay Grade/Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL3264 Self-Represented Litigant Administrator</td>
<td>L-807 ($51,066 – $66,386 – $81,706)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Member LaNee Reynolds made a motion, seconded by Board Co-Chair Karen DuWaldt, to approve Classification Notice No. 1658, which was unanimously approved by the Board.

2. Classification Notice No. 1659 – Classification Abolishments

Lori Schumann, Sr. Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Classification Notice No. 1659 to amend the classification and pay plan by abolishing various classifications from the city’s classification structure.

Every year Class & Comp reviews any classifications not being utilized for potential abolishment from the city’s classification structure. The following criteria are used to determine if a classification can be abolished: (1) created before the implementation of Workday (January 2017); (2) Not currently being used by an agency and has no incumbents.

As a result of the review, 10 classifications are proposed for abolishment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Code</th>
<th>Pay Grade</th>
<th>Classification Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA0744</td>
<td>A-813</td>
<td>Concession &amp; Asset Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA3001</td>
<td>A-813</td>
<td>EEO Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG2112</td>
<td>Z-118</td>
<td>Non-Certified Fitness Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2994</td>
<td>A-807</td>
<td>Associate HR Business Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA3020</td>
<td>A-808</td>
<td>HR Service Center Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2718</td>
<td>O-817</td>
<td>Lead Pharmacist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ2553</td>
<td>J-610</td>
<td>Maintenance Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV2453</td>
<td>V-810</td>
<td>Risk Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ2077</td>
<td>J-609</td>
<td>Transportation Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ2040</td>
<td>J-610</td>
<td>Senior Transportation Worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Member David Hayes made a motion, seconded by Board Member Patricia Barela Rivera, to approve Classification Notice No. 1659, which was unanimously approved by the Board.


Ms. Britton noted the City’s Employee Health Insurance Committee (the “Committee”), established by DRMC section 18-181, is responsible for advising the Career Service Board and the Office of Human Resources (“OHR”) regarding any recommended changes to the employee medical, life, dental and long-term disability insurance benefit programs. Eligible employees are those defined in DRMC section 18-171.

Ms. Britton highlighted the members of the Health Insurance Committee, noting some members are mandated by ordinance to be represented (City Council, Police, Fire, Sheriff).

For 2021, there are very few changes to the medical plans overall, with the Denver Health Medical Plan offering being modified to an in-network benefit only, and CVS/Target pharmacies being removed from United Healthcare’s participating pharmacy network.
The City will continue to offer both a deductible health maintenance organization plan ("DHMO") and a high-deductible health plan ("HDHP") with Kaiser and United Healthcare. Monthly premium costs will minimally change in 2021.

The Denver Health Medical Plan will no longer have an out-of-network option through Cofinity and participants will have to obtain care through Denver Health providers only at the main medical center or in one of nine community-based primary care clinics in the Denver Metro area. The HMO option will not have a deductible, but will require co-pays and 20% co-insurance, while the HDHP option will continue to have a deductible.

Board Co-Chair Neil Peck asked if the city had ever undertaken a study comparing the medical plan offerings in terms of the quality of care provided.

Ms. Britton responded that type of study really focuses less on the insurance carrier and more on a specific hospital or medical provider. Ms. Britton also noted she is a board member of the Colorado Business Group on Health and one of their areas of focus is reviewing the difference in cost of care and rate of re-admission among area hospitals, which is the major cost driver.

Mr. Peck asked if the plans are all using the same hospitals, to which Ms. Britton replied in the affirmative, although Kaiser sends most of their patients to SCL hospitals. Ms. Britton stated she hoped to have more cost comparison data on area hospitals to share in the future.

Mr. Peck asked if employees ask about quality measures when open enrollment occurs, which Ms. Britton replied most employees make their decision based on convenience and current medical providers. City employees either prefer the integrated, one-stop care provided through Kaiser’s offices, or they prefer to have maximum choice and control over individual providers by selecting their own through United Healthcare.

Mr. Peck asked if OHR surveys employees about their satisfaction with the medical plans, which Ms. Britton replied in the negative, stating past surveys have focused more on the type of benefits employees would like to have, however, surveying employees about plan designs and deductibles may be more informative in the future.

Mr. Peck commented it seems most employees are most concerned about the cost, rather than quality, which Ms. Britton agreed was the case.

Board Member David Hayes asked whether any negative feedback is expected from employees enrolled in Denver Health Medical Plan from limiting coverage next year to in-network providers only. Ms. Britton responded 199 employees are currently enrolled and there is some concern as some participants use the out-of-network coverage, but are saving money from using a Denver Health pharmacy to fill their prescriptions. Communication will be important in explaining the change.

Ms. Britton highlighted two pharmacy network changes for 2021. United Healthcare participants will no longer be able to use CVS/Target pharmacies, which will save an estimated $878,000 over three years, and a variable co-pay program will be implemented for United DHMO participants using the specialty pharmacy, which lowers their co-pays when the manufacturer savings negotiated by Optum RX is applied.

Ms. Britton noted the public hearing notice does not require any action on the Board’s part. Mr. Peck thanked Ms. Britton for her presentation today.

VI. Executive Session:

The Board went into executive session at 9:44am and discussed several OHR issues with Karen Niparko.

VII. Adjournment: Adjournment was at 10:13am.